

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA  
WESTERN DIVISION  
No. 5:13-CV-82-D

SAMUEL LYNN HARRISON,  
)  
Plaintiff,  
)  
v.  
)  
CITY OF DURHAM, et al.,  
)  
Defendants.  
)

## ORDER

On February 12, 2013, the court denied plaintiff Samuel Lynn Harrison's ("Harrison" or "plaintiff") application to proceed without prepayment of fees [D.E. 1, 4]. On March 14, 2013, Harrison paid the filing fee. On March 15, 2013, Harrison filed an amended complaint [D.E. 10].

In his amended complaint, Harrison names the following defendants: City of Durham, FBI, DOJ, EEOC, Norment Security Group, CAE USA Inc., Lockheed Martin, NC DOT, Walmart, Goshen Rubber Inc., Robeson Community College, and Lumberton Senior High School. See [D.E. 6] 2. Harrison alleges “Religious/Racial/Character Harassment violations from Employers” stemming from “an unconstitutional corporate-government alliance agenda.” [D.E. 10] 3–4. As evidence, Harrison refers to “President IKE’s 1960 ‘in danger of being overtaken by the Military-Industrial Complex’ speech, President JFK’s 1963 ‘Secrecy is Repugnant’ speech, . . . [and] [a]tttempted & successful assassinations of Presidents Madison, Lincoln, & JFK for re-instituting the Constitutionally specified Gold Standard.” Id. 5. Harrison alleges a wide-ranging government conspiracy executed through “PATENTED Mind Control & similar Technologies” leading to “Agent-manufactured assassins or scape goats presented by ‘corporate media’ as ‘Loan Gunmen’

despite eye-witness victims' accounts." Id. 4. He seeks to "reveal to all, perpetrators especially, that Humans are NOT Resources and are endowed and entitled to Human Rights regardless of any circumstances (war or peace time alike)." Id. 3. These descriptions are a small sample of the wholly irrational amended complaint. See id. 3-8.

A case is frivolous if it "lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact." Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989). A complaint is frivolous where "it lacks an arguable basis . . . in law." Id. "Legally frivolous claims are based on an indisputably meritless legal theory and include claims of infringement of a legal interest which clearly does not exist . . ." Adams v. Rice, 40 F.3d 72, 75 (4th Cir. 1994) (quoting Neitzke, 490 U.S. at 327). A complaint may be frivolous where it "lacks an arguable basis . . . in fact." Neitzke, 490 U.S. at 325. Section 1915 permits federal courts "to pierce the veil of the complaint's factual allegations and dismiss those claims whose factual contentions are clearly baseless." Denton v. Hernandez, 504 U.S. 25, 32 (1992). Examples of such claims include those "describing fantastic or delusional scenarios," or claims which are otherwise manifestly "fanciful" or so wholly irrational as to lack any basis in fact. Id. at 32-33; see Adams, 40 F.3d at 74-75.

Harrison's amended complaint is filled with delusional scenarios and wholly irrational statements. The amended complaint is DISMISSED as frivolous. Harrison's other motions [D.E. 3, 9] are DENIED. The clerk shall close the case.

SO ORDERED. This 12 day of April 2013.



JAMES C. DEVER III  
Chief United States District Judge